



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/774,253	02/06/2004	Mikko Nurmi	KOLS.094PA	8645

7590 07/13/2007
Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
Suite 125
8009 34th Avenue South
Minneapolis, MN 55425

EXAMINER

SHAPIRO, LEONID

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/13/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/774,253

Applicant(s)

NURMI, MIKKO

Examiner

Leonid Shapiro

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 10-13 and 19-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9, 14-18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 1-2, 10-11, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. (US Patent No. 6,835,013 B2) in view of Bary et al (Pub. No.: US 2004/0158429 A1).

As to claim 1, Dunn et al. teaches a method of editing a character string displayed on a touchscreen with an indicator means (See Fig. 1, item 106, from Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 25) , the method comprising:

displaying, on the touchscreen (in the reference display and keyboard (fig. 1, items 106, 108), could be replaced with touch screen (col. 3, lines 6-8)), at least one character string comprising a plurality of characters (Fig. 5, items 206, 210); and

editing the character string that characters are deleted from the character string (See Fig. 5, items 206, 210, 212, Col. 7, Lines 1-4).

Dunn et al. does not disclose the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string.

Barry et al. teaches the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

Art Unit: 2629

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate teachings of Barry et al. into Dunn et al. system in order to change the characters in the string (See paragraph 0184 in the Bary et al. reference).

As to claims 10,19-20 Dunnet al. teaches an electronic device (See Fig. 1, item 106, from Col. 2, Line 66 to Col. 3, Line 25) comprising:

a touchscreen, on which touchscreen the device is configured to display (in the reference display and keyboard (fig. 1, items 106,108), could be replaced with touch screen (col. 3, lines 6-8)), at least one character string comprising a plurality of characters (Fig. 5, items 206,210); and

means for editing the character string that characters are deleted from the character string (Fig. 1, items 106,108, col. 3, lines 6-8 and Fig. 5, items 206,210,212, Col. 7, Lines 1-4).

Dunn et al. does not disclose the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string.

Barry et al. teaches the indicator means such that the characters after the indication point are deleted from the character string (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to incorporate teachings of Barry et al. into Dunn et al. system in order to change the characters in the string (See paragraph 0184 in the Bary et al. reference).

As to claims 2,11,21 Bary et al. teaches character string being a network address displayed in an address field of a browser program (See paragraphs 0196-0197).

Art Unit: 2629

3. Claims 3,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. and Bary et al. as applied to claims 2,11 above, and further in view of Birrell (US Patent No. 6,470,027).

As to claims 3,12 Dunn et al. and Bary et al. do not disclose initiating automatically the loading of the network address according to the edited character string by said browser program in response to the editing of the character string.

Birrell teaches initiating automatically the loading of the network address according to the edited character string by said browser program in response to the editing of the character string (See Fig. 1, from Col. 2, Line 56 to Col. 3 Line 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Birrell into Dunn et al. and Bary et al. system in order to redirect web page (See Col. 2, Lines 9-17 in the Birrell reference).

4. Claims 4,13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. and Bary et al. as applied to claims 2,11 above, and further in view of Iwata (JP 02-204848 A).

As to claims 3,12 Dunn et al. and Bary et al. do not disclose displaying said character string in the address field of the browser program based on predictive address entry.

Iwata teaches translating said character string in the address field of the browser program based on predictive address entry (See Costitution).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate teachings of Iwata into Dunn et al. and Bary et al. system in update translation predicting means (See Purpose in the Iwata reference).

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 5-9,14-18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Relative to claim 5,14 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Bary et al., Dunn et al. and Birrell) and the instant invention is that the touchscreen is configured to identify the duration of the indication in relation to a predetermined limit value, the method further comprising initiating said automatic loading of the network address in response to the duration of the indication exceeding the predetermined limit value.

Claims 8 and 17 depend on claims 5 and 14.

Relative to claim 6,15 the major difference between the teaching of the prior art of record (Bary et al., Dunn et al. and Birrell) and the instant invention is that the touchscreen is configured to identify the direction of movement of the indication in relation to a predetermined limit value, the method further comprising initiating said automatic loading of the network address in response to the direction of movement of the indication being within the limits set by the predetermined limit value.

Claims 7,9 and 16,18 depend on claims 6 and 15.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 04.19.07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive:

On page 7, 3rd paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that more specifically, Dunn does not teach displaying a character string on a touchscreen, as claimed in each of the independent claims. Instead, Dunn indicates that display 108 is a liquid crystal display (column 3, lines 1-2). The only mention of a touchscreen in the cited portions of Dunn refers to input means, not a display for a character string (column 3, lines 5-8). However, Dunn teaches display and keyboard (fig. 1, items 106,108), could be replaced with touch screen (col. 3, lines 6-8).

On page 8, 1st paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that Examiner has not identified what is asserted as corresponding to the "indicator means" or how such teaching is used to make an indication. However, Bary et al. teaches the "indicator means" in paragraph 0196 as: "i.e. delete all characters after "SID")".

On page 9, 3rd paragraph of Remarks, Applicant's stated that the examiner must show some objective teaching leading to the asserted combination. However, Bary et al. teaches in paragraph 0184 to change (including to delete characters in paragraph 0196) the characters in the string (See paragraph 0184 in the Bary et al. reference).

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning on page 10, 1st paragraph of Remarks, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense

Art Unit: 2629

necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Telephone Inquire


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leonid Shapiro whose telephone number is 571-272-7683. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

Art Unit: 2629

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

LS
06.28.07



RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600